



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

A special reason why I publish these notes in this periodical is that it is read by "all sorts and conditions of men."<sup>8</sup> My readers who have doubtless inspected French and German MSS. may remember other instances.<sup>9</sup> The matter seemed to me of sufficient importance to be made the subject of an investigation. Now that attention has been called to these drawings I may expect others to add more material to the scanty number of cases in point at my command.

The instances—few as they are—on which I base my hypothesis, are curiously enough all taken from one (15th c.) Oxford MS. (Ashmole 61). Autopsy of that MS. would perhaps reveal more cases.

H. LOGEMAN.

*University of Ghent, Belgium.*

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF *cl* INTO *ʃ* IN THE ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

In his 'Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen' §§421 et seq. and §§487 et seq., MEYER-LÜBKE admits a difference of development between *cl* when initial and when medial. Initial *cl*, we are told, changed to *kly* and from this new sound either *ʃ* or *ky* developed in the usually accepted way. Medial *cl* followed the same line of change completely only in Roumanian, and in Italian with the exception of *cli* (which passed through *cli' > ʃ*) and *cl'* (where *gl' > gl' > ʃ* were the intervening steps). In the remaining part of the Romance speech-territory, however, *cl* went through changes similar to *cl'*, that is, *cl > χl > ʃl > ʃ*. This theory is carried out by MEYER-LÜBKE in his characteristic scholarly manner, and sustained by an almost bewildering mass of material. But inasmuch as it is based upon

<sup>8</sup> I am especially thinking of its European readers.

<sup>9</sup> Just now, Prof. H. PIRENNE of this University calls my attention to an account of a fifteenth century MS. at Luxembourg. The last two lines of this MS. which, be it distinctly understood, treats of theological matters, read as follows:

*Et est finis, sit laus et gloria ternis (sic!)*  
*Explicit iste liber de pisce (?) Sum modo liber.*

The point of interrogation shows that the writer of this account (BONNARDOT; see 'Archives des Missions,' 1889, p. 380) did not see the allusion. As I have not seen the MS. I can but guess that it may be another—very interesting—general application of the word *pisce*.

the analogy of the development of *cl'*, which, as is well known, is itself a moot question, doubts may arise as to the necessity of making the distinction. It seemed to the writer that the question would be placed in its true light, if we correctly understood the first step in the development, that of *cl < kly*. It is quite possible to pronounce *c* and *l* in such a way that *c* is a true velar guttural (γ<sub>0h</sub>),<sup>1</sup> and this was no doubt the pronunciation from which the svarabhaktic vowel developed in such words as PERICULUM for older PERICLUM. In popular speech, however, this vowel was early dropped, or, what is more probable, it was never developed at all; cf. MEYER-LÜBKE, l. c. §487. But the combination *cl<sup>vowel</sup>* is a peculiar one. Standing as it does at the beginning of an increasing scale of resonances, *c* is especially exposed to the influence of the following sounds, and since *l* is pronounced in the front of the mouth, there will be a strong tendency at work to reduce to a minimum the distance between the places of articulation of *c* and *l*. That such a fronting did actually take place, is proved by the fact that grammarians found it necessary to guard against the pronunciation of *cl* for medial *ʃl*, a change which, for the rest, is a well attested fact in many languages; cf. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG, MOD. LANG. NOTES iii, col. 126-130. In this combination, which is intermediate between *cl* and *ʃl*, the front of the tongue articulates against the hard palate somewhat above the alveolars (JESPERSEN's γ<sub>0g</sub>). If one tries to pronounce this sound by itself, it will be found that as soon as the closure is broken (γ<sub>0g</sub> > γ<sub>2g</sub>), a parasitic *j* sound is heard.<sup>2</sup> The same sound is found as the first articulation in ITALIAN *ci* and *gi* (JESPERSEN §60), or in the common French pronunciation *piquié* for *pitié*,

<sup>1</sup> I take occasion to make use here of the phonetic transcription of JESPERSEN, 'The Articulations of Speech Sounds, represented by alphabetic symbols,' Marburg, 1889; cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES v, col. 172. The student of Romance philology owes an immeasurable debt of gratitude to the industry which could produce such a master-work as the Grammar of MEYER-LÜBKE, and I am sure that I am animated by the regard due from the beginner to the master. I merely wish to present a few difficulties which I experienced while studying the paragraphs in question, and it is but fair to confess that I am indebted in a large degree to the closer analysis of sounds made possible by the use of JESPERSEN's transcriptions.

*cinquième* for *cinquème* (JESPERSEN §71). But since its acoustic effect, when followed by *l*, is more like *cl* than *tl*, we never find the reverse change (*cl* > *tl*) recorded. Thus the first step in the development was *ct* <sup>1,3</sup>. This stage is still kept in certain Raetian dialects; cf. *tl̥er* Grd., *tl̥er* Abt., *tl̥er* Enn. (=CLARUS), GARTNER in GRÖBER'S 'Grundriss' i, p. 478, note 3; *tl̥amè* (CLAMARE), *dlaca* (GLACIES), SCHUCHARDT, 'Voc.' iii, p. 83 cited by SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG, l. c.

In *Publications* of the MOD. LANG. ASSOCIATION v, p. 56, the writer supposed that the thin off-glide after the *l*, which is attested by Latin grammarians (cf. SEELMANN, 'Ausprache des Latein,' p. 325) and which in tone-color approached *i*, was the primal cause for the development, as in case of *labial* + *l* and *ll*. In the case under consideration it might perhaps be added that the palatal nature of *ct* aided to produce the same result. *ct* <sup>l</sup> changed to *ct̥ly*, which is still found in some French dialects. In certain patois of the NORMAN we have *glleru*, *clloque*, GUERNSEY *clloque*: EGGERT, 'Entwicklung der Normandischen Mundart,' *Zf. R.Ph.* xiii, p. 391; GUERNSEY *gll̥ic*, *cllaou*, *cllichards* in two selections in the GUERNSEY dialect by CORBET, MOD. LANG. NOTES iv, col. 333 ff. The same sound is found in the canton Vaud, the upper valley of the Rhone, part of Savoy and Franche-Comté: MEYER-LÜBKE, l. c. §424. Port. goes one step further by dropping the *l*, and *ct* + *y* passes subsequently through *t̥χ* > *t̥s̥* > *s̥* (*chamar*). Tyrolese *tyau* (CLAVU) in the Cembra valley, *kyaf* in Vigo, *tyef* in Colle (MEYER-LÜBKE l. c. §423) still retain the original pronunciation *ct* + *y*, which can equally well be represented by *ky* or *ty*.<sup>4</sup> In Italian *l* dropped as in Portuguese, but in the remaining combination *ky* (*ct̥y*), the *y* was gradually raised to the value of a full vowel (as in *chiamaire*), and, as a consequence, the position of *ct̥* was shifted somewhat back, so that it again became *k* (JESPERSEN'S *γoh̥g*). In Spanish, on the other hand, a process of assimilation went on, the result of which was *ḷ*.

<sup>2</sup> *γ2g̥* is a variety of *j* sound, JESPERSEN l. c. §105.

<sup>3</sup> By *ct̥* I denote the sound spoken of here, JESPERSEN'S *γoh̥g*.

<sup>4</sup> A similar change takes place in Canadian French *t̥vr̥é* and *k̥χ̥vr̥é* = *curé*.

As regards the medial position, the following considerations may aid to determine the history of the development. The Romans divided a word into syllables according to the acoustic impressions and the consciousness of articulation (*Articulationsgefühl*), and since they wrote HER-CU-LE and HER-CLE (SEELMANN, l. c. p. 144), it follows that medial *cl* produced the same impression on the ear as initial *cl*. Since initial *tl* did not exist in Latin, changes to *cl* can of course not be recorded for us. The only similar case is "stlataris sine c littera dicendum ab stlata," SEELMANN, l. c., p. 312; but for medial *tl* we have "martulus non marculus, vetulus non veclus, capitulum non capiculum," *ibid.* Other cases, where this same change is proved indirectly (as It. *fischiare* = Lat. *FISTULARE*), are given by SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG, l. c., col. 129. VECLUM was pronounced with *ct̥* (*γoh̥g*), and since OC'LUM gives the same result, it seems reasonable to suppose that in both words the original pronunciation of *cl* was identical. But even granting that in VECLUM the same general development took place which MEYER-LÜBKE posits for FACTUM, that is, "Enge + Verschluss statt Verschluss + Verschluss" (l. c., §462), the result would be JESPERSEN'S *γ2g̥*, the initial sound of Eng. *you* and Germ. *ja*, and we should already be far from *χ*, the velar voiceless spirant. The change of *cl* > *ḷ* had been completed in France before the law came into operation according to which the final unaccented vowel (except *a*) had to fall; MEYER-LÜBKE, l. c., §314. The parasitic palatal which developed after *ct̥* had therefore a support here as well as in the initial position, and if JESPERSEN'S descriptions are correct, the change is of the simplest kind. *γoh̥g* + *βii̯ef* by a process of assimilation, changed to *β̥e γii̯g̥*, which means that the divided articulation was shifted from the point of the tongue to the place where, before, the stop was made for *ct̥*. The point of the tongue is now not concerned in the articulation at all, and is resting against the lower teeth. In some Romance dialects *cl* has changed to *gl* (*dl*) under varying conditions. This however is a change taking place in the larynx, and does not affect the development in the mouth. All the different Romance forms can easily be explained in a

manner similar to those in initial position; Raetian again shows some very old forms; cf. *uedl*, *oredla*, *vedl*: MEYER-LÜBKE l. c., §490. Spanish *hijo* and *viejo* show that they both derive from forms with *ĭ*.

That this development was not foreign to the general tendency of French phonetics, is proved by the fact that a similar development is seen today in the JERSEY and GUERNSEY dialects. EGGERT, l. c., cites only *onlle*, *anlle* for *ongle*, *angle*. In the selections in the Guernsey dialect by CORBET, referred to above, the following examples in point occur; namely, *sercilleux*, *égllise*, *cercilles*. In the same dialects *l* after labials undergoes the same change; cf. *parapllie*, *blu* (*bleu*), *espllique*, *pllu* (*plu*), *flanc*, *cribble*, *semblable*, *insaquiable*, and EGGERT, l. c., gives *bile* (*blé*) *pilleume*, *flle* (*fleur*), *fablle*, *ainnable*.

These cases, in a dialect which has preserved so many old forms, seem to render it reasonably certain that initial and medial *cl* did not materially differ from each other in their development.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

*Bowdoin College.*

---

*Studies in Literature and Style.* By THEODORE W. HUNT, Ph. D. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son. 1890. 8vo, pp. xiv, 503.

We are inclined to regard this book, in its essential characteristics, as an advance upon Professor HUNT's previous works in the same or in kindred fields of study. His grasp of the subject is firmer, his sympathies broader, his appreciation of the æsthetic phases of literature keener, his whole tone and spirit more catholic.

Nothing could be purer than the ethical quality that prevades the volume, nothing more apposite than the protest against the ruthless materialism which has in great measure effaced ideals and destroyed idealism in American life and American literature. We are especially gratified to note the discriminating tribute to the late Principal SHAIRP, whose 'Aspects of Poetry,' 'Studies in Poetry and Philosophy,' etc., exhibit the analytical temper of the Scottish intellect, blended with

the artistic grace of NEWMAN and the austere righteousness of THOMAS ARNOLD. Every such contribution as the work before us, is an additional proof of the increasing range and expanding influence that marks the progress of English scholarship in America. Twenty years ago such books were an impossibility. The 'Lectures' of HENRY REED, in whose harmonious character were displayed some of those ideal qualities of which the scholarly imagination but dreamed, had no successor in literature, as none in life.

"His soul was like a star and dwelt apart."

Those of us who can recall the complacent age of JAMISON, QUACKENBOS, and CAMPBELL, or to whom the faint tradition of BLAIR and KAMES has descended, may in the light of such contemporary criticism as that of MINTO, SHAIRP, SAINTSBURY, HUNT and PATTISON, echo the apostolic note of triumph—"old things are passed away, behold, all things are become new." We cordially commend Professor HUNT's book, in its main features, to students of literature, as well as to university and collegiate instructors, to all, indeed, who are imbued with the culture sense and are eager for its nurture and development.

While bestowing this general approval, we cannot fail to specify some blemishes and imperfections which may be easily removed in a subsequent edition. In the first chapter (page 26) we discover that Professor HUNT has fallen into the common and seemingly invincible error of ascribing to BUFFON an expression which, so far as we are aware, he never uttered, at least in its prevalent and wide-spread form. If BUFFON ever said "the style is the man himself," ("le style c'est l'homme,") it does *not* occur in his famous discourse upon style delivered in 1753, upon the occasion of his formal reception as a member of the French Academy. Yet MARK PATTISON in his essay upon MUVETUS PATER in his study of style, BARTLETT in his 'Dictionary of Quotations' and, stranger than all, SAINTSBURY in his 'Short History of French Literature' (page 498), have adopted the common perversion of BUFFON's famous *dictum*. The style of BUFFON is marked by inflation and by flamboyant touches characteristic of the man, and, in a